

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/797,303 | 03/09/2004 | Gary Weller | 514362001410 | 4452 | |
| John S. Nagy | 7590 09/09/2909 | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| (Fulwider, Patt | on , Lee & Utecht, LLP | YABUT, DIANE D | | | |
| Howard Hughes Center 6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| Los Angeles, (| | | 3734 | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 00/00/2000 | PAPER MODE | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|------------|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| 10/797,303 | | WELLER ET AL. | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | DIANE YABUT | 3734 | | |

| | DIANE YABUT | 3734 | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF | | | | | | | |
| ITER REFLET FILED 2# ANGUSTA COME THAT STOP LOCK FIRS APPLICATION IN COUNTRIES FOR A TRANSPORT AND A TRANSPORT | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (| dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period or extension and the corresponding amount of the fee appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed with the notice of Appeal has | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | · | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b They raise new issues that would require further core They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed). | sideration and/or search (see NO | | cause | | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | | ducing or simplifying t | ne issues for | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | | | | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). would be all | owabie ir submitted in a separate, i | imely filed amendmer | it canceling the | | | | |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. | | I be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 29-36. | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing- entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | | |
| /Todd E Manahan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3734 | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant generally argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify Deem with Adams to provide the first and second tissue acquisitions of Deem in a pivobable relationship about a longitudinal hinge, because doing so would not provide by benefit. However, Deem discloses stapler devices 170 and 190 (Figures 9A-10) with elongate first and second acquisition members divided by septa 184 and 196 that would benefit from a longitudinal hinge, as taught by Adams' stapler device in Figures 21-25, which shows a first 10 and second 17 tissue acquisition member that may be adjusted relative to one another to acquire tissue. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide this longitudinal hinge since both Deem and Adams invovle stapling devices wherein grasping and acquiring tissue is facilitated by pivotable members to ensure secure engagement. Providing a hinge about which two tissue acquisition members can pivot is old and well known in the art.

Applicant also generally argues that stapler 17 and anvil of Adams cannot be considered as "tissue acquisition members." However, being a stapler, both elements contact or engage tissue at some point, and therefore read on this limitation.

Lastly, applicant asserts that the elements of claim 35 have not been discussed by the examiner, including first and second tissue receiving cavities between the stapling member and the anvil member. However, for example in Deem Figures 94-98 theer are first and second tissue cavities in between anvil 182 and stapler 172 and divided between the septum 184, and therefore the device reads on this limitation.